IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Confirmation No.: 6529

Coun Art Unit: 1772

In re REISSUE APPLICATION OF

Rodney M. SHIELDS

**Application No.: 09/267,025** 

Filed: March 11, 1999

Title: IMAGE DISPLAY APPARATUS WITH HOLES FOR OPPOSITE SIDE

**VIEWING** 

### APPLICANTS RESPONSE TO PETITIONERS' WITHDRAWAL FROM PUBLIC USE PROCEEDING AND REQUEST FOR RETURN OF ALL OF PETITIONERS' FILED PAPERS

**Examiner: William P. Watkins III** 

Hon. Commissioner of Patents P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Sir:

In the public use proceeding of the above-referenced reissue application, Applicant hereby responds to Petitioners' Withdrawal from Public Use Proceeding filed on June 3, 2003 and requests a continued stay of any filing to provide rebuttal evidence and argument.

#### I. Acceptance of Withdrawal

Petitioners' have (1) withdrawn from the Public Use Proceeding, and (2) withdrawn the Petitioners' Testimony (including that filed on March 21, 2003 and May 5, 2003). The Petitioners' withdrawal should be accepted. As requested by Petitioner, the Petition filed on December 8, 1999 (and all of the Petition's Exhibits) should be withdrawn and returned and all of Petitioners' Testimony should be withdrawn and returned to Petitioner.

#### All papers including all Exhibits, attachments, appendices and enclosures should be II. returned and removed from the record.

In addition to Withdrawing, Petitioners have failed to make available affiants for cross examination as requested by Applicant on May 27, 2003. Therefore any Testimony, Exhibits, and papers submitted by Petitioners with the Petition or on March 21, 2003 or May 5, 2003 should be withdrawn and returned.

#### III. There Is No Evidence of Public Use From This Public Use Proceeding

There is no evidence on the record of public use from this proceeding. First, with the Petitioners' withdrawal of the Petition and withdrawal of the Testimony, the record is expunged of any documentation that might suggest public use. Second, the documentation nor the Testimony was authenticated, verified, crossed or confronted and is therefore unavailable and not evidence. Third, the documentation nor the testimony was at all clear and there is no explanation. Therefore, it is not known how the documents or material are relevant nor to which pending claims they may have applied. In conclusion, there is no evidence of public use.

With the withdrawal, it is as if the Petition was never filed, no papers were filed and the proceedings never occurred.

# IV. Upon the Return to Petitioners of All of Petitioners' Filings, Applicant Request Return of All of Applicants' Filings during the Proceeding

Once Petitioners' papers are returned, Applicant's papers should also be returned. There is no need to have Applicant's Objections and Request for Cross-Examination in the record.

Upon removal of Petitioners papers, Applicant requests withdrawal and return of Applicant's papers filed during proceeding.

#### V. Self-Serving, Contradictory, and Erroneous Statements in Petitioners' Withdrawal

Petitioners' extraneous statements in Withdrawal should be ignored and removed from the record. Petitioners' state that (1) "... resulting patent protection is commercially irrelevant to Petitioner", (2) "Petitioner is confident ... that any resulting patent protection is appropriately limited", (3) "if the reissue application ... is relevant to Petitioners' business, Petitioner is confident that the overwhelming evidence of public use provided during this proceeding will invalidate any improperly broad claims that are asserted ..."

These statements are made as the Petitioners withdraw from the proceeding and withdraw all of the "overwhelming evidence." The only thing that is clear from Petitioners' act of withdrawal and three statements is that the Petitioners are not at all confident of their patent position. There is no evidence of public use. The statements are self-serving, contradictory, erroneous, and non-sensical.

# VI. Applicant Requests a Continued Stay of Any Filing to Provide Rebuttal Evidence and Argument Until the Withdrawal is Accepted

There is no point in Applicant providing rebuttal evidence prior to the Withdrawal being accepted by the Examiner. Therefore, Applicant requests a continuation of the stay of the requirement to file rebuttal evidence and argument.

Applicant respectfully requests a prompt return to the Reissue Prosecution.

Respectfully submitted,

DORSEY & WHITNEY LLP

Aldo Noto

Reg. No. 35,628

1001 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW Suite 400 South Washington, DC 20004

Phone: 202-442-3000 Facsimile: 202-442-3199

Attachment: Proof of Service Under 37 CFR § 1.248

### PROOF OF SERVICE UNDER 37 CFR § 1.248

I hereby certify that a true copy of the foregoing APPLICANTS RESPONSE TO PETITIONERS' WITHDRAWAL FROM PUBLIC USE PROCEEDING AND REQUEST FOR RETURN OF ALL OF PETITIONERS' FILED PAPERS was served by facsimile and by U.S. First Class Mail this 18<sup>th</sup> day of August, 2003, on counsel for the Petitioner indicated below:

Jack S. Barufka Benjamin L. Kiersz Pillsbury Winthrop LLP 1600 Tysons Boulevard McLean, VA 22102 Tel: 703-905-2000

Fax: 703-905-2500

Attorney for Applicant

9

DORSEY & WHITNEY

OFFICIAL 2001

## DORSEY & WHITNEY LLP

Minneapolis Seattle New York Washington, e.C.

DENVER LONDON DES MOINES ANCHORAGE SALT LAKK CITY

Pargo Southern California 1001 PENNSYLVANIA AVENUE, N.W.
SUITE 400 SOUTH
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20004-2533
TELEPHONE: (202) 442-3000
FAX: (202) 442-3199
www.doiseylaw.com

TH N 1904-2533 42-3000 5199 com DRUSSELS OF TOKYO
HONG KONC
GREAT FALLS
ROCKESTER
TORONTO
MISSOULA
SHANGHAI
VANCOUVER

### **FAX COVER SHEET**

have received this me	tained in this facsimile message, if a client y privileged and confidential information. essage in error, (1) do not read the message of the sender below.	of this firm is a named addressee, or the If you are not a named addressee, or below; (2) do not distribute or copy this	e message is otherwise intende if there is any reason to believe is facsimile; and (3) please im-	ed for a client, is we that you may nechately call us
DATE:	August 18, 2003	TOTAL # OF PAGES (INCLUDING THIS COVER SHEET): 5		
TO: FIRM NAME:	Examiner William P. Watkins, III US Patent and Trademark Office	FAX #: TELEPHONE #:	703 872 9311 703 308 2420	
FROM:	Aldo Noto	FAX #:	(202) 442-3199	
TELEPHONE #:	202/442-3520	EMAIL:	noto.aldo@dorseylaw.com	
COMMENTS:				
Dear Examiner Watki	ins			
Attached for your info	ormation are papers filed today in "In re Rei	ssuc Application Ser. No. 09/267,025		
Aldo Noto, Reg. No. 3	35,628			
		•		
		Originator's Si	la Thela	

PLEASE CONTACT M. JANE STRAHL AT 202/442-3624 IF THIS TRANSMISSION IS INCOMPLETE OR CANNOT BE READ.

Reference#

Messenger

468824/8

Air Courier

Will not be sent

4820-4029-0816\1 5/27/2003 12:06 PM

Original will be sent via:

Mail

08/18/03 16:05 FAX 202 824 8990

#### IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

In re REISSUE APPLICATION OF

Confirmation No.: 6529

Rodney M. SHIELDS

Group Art Unit: 1772

Application No.: 09/267,025

Examiner: William P. Watkins III

Filed: March 11, 1999

Title: IMAGE DISPLAY APPARATUS WITH HOLES FOR OPPOSITE SIDE

VIEWING

### APPLICANTS RESPONSE TO PETITIONERS' WITHDRAWAL FROM PUBLIC USE PROCEEDING AND REQUEST FOR RETURN OF ALL OF PETITIONERS' FILED PAPERS

Hon. Commissioner of Patents P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

**OFFICIAL** 

Sir:

In the public use proceeding of the above-referenced reissue application, Applicant hereby responds to Petitioners' Withdrawal from Public Use Proceeding filed on June 3, 2003 and requests a continued stay of any filing to provide rebuttal evidence and argument.

#### I. Acceptance of Withdrawal

Petitioners' have (1) withdrawn from the Public Use Proceeding, and (2) withdrawn the Petitioners' Testimony (including that filed on March 21, 2003 and May 5, 2003). The Petitioners' withdrawal should be accepted. As requested by Petitioner, the Petition filed on December 8, 1999 (and all of the Petition's Exhibits) should be withdrawn and returned and all of Petitioners' Testimony should be withdrawn and returned to Petitioner.

#### П. All papers including all Exhibits, attachments, appendices and enclosures should be returned and removed from the record.

In addition to Withdrawing, Petitioners have failed to make available affiants for cross examination as requested by Applicant on May 27, 2003. Therefore any Testimony, Exhibits, and papers submitted by Petitioners with the Petition or on March 21, 2003 or May 5, 2003 should be withdrawn and returned.

**FAX RECEIVED** 

AUG 19 2003

TC 1700

## III. There Is N Evidence of Public Use From This Public Use Proceeding

There is no evidence on the record of public use from this proceeding. First, with the Petitioners' withdrawal of the Petition and withdrawal of the Testimony, the record is expunged of any documentation that might suggest public use. Second, the documentation nor the Testimony was authenticated, verified, crossed or confronted and is therefore unavailable and not evidence. Third, the documentation nor the testimony was at all clear and there is no explanation. Therefore, it is not known how the documents or material are relevant nor to which pending claims they may have applied. In conclusion, there is no evidence of public use.

With the withdrawal, it is as if the Petition was never filed, no papers were filed and the proceedings never occurred.

# IV. Upon the Return to Petitioners of All of Petitioners' Filings, Applicant Request Return of All of Applicants' Filings during the Proceeding

Once Petitioners' papers are returned, Applicant's papers should also be returned. There is no need to have Applicant's Objections and Request for Cross-Examination in the record. Upon removal of Petitioners papers, Applicant requests withdrawal and return of Applicant's papers filed during proceeding.

## V. Self-Serving, Contradictory, and Erroneous Statements in Petitioners' Withdrawal

Petitioners' extraneous statements in Withdrawal should be ignored and removed from the record. Petitioners' state that (1) "... resulting patent protection is commercially irrelevant to Petitioner', (2) "Petitioner is confident... that any resulting patent protection is appropriately limited", (3) "if the reissue application... is relevant to Petitioners' business, Petitioner is confident that the overwhelming evidence of public use provided during this proceeding will invalidate any improperly broad claims that are asserted..."

These statements are made as the Petitioners withdraw from the proceeding and withdraw all of the "overwhelming evidence." The only thing that is clear from Petitioners' act of withdrawal and three statements is that the Petitioners are not at all confident of their patent position. There is no evidence of public use. The statements are self-serving, contradictory, erroneous, and non-sensical.

# VI. Applicant Requests a Continued Stay of Any Filing to Provide Rebuttal Evidence and Argument Until the Withdrawal is Accepted

There is no point in Applicant providing rebuttal evidence prior to the Withdrawal being accepted by the Examiner. Therefore, Applicant requests a continuation of the stay of the requirement to file rebuttal evidence and argument.

Applicant respectfully requests a prompt return to the Reissue Prosecution.

Respectfully submitted,

DORSEY & WHITNEY LLP

By:

Aldo Noto Reg. No. 35,628

1001 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW Suite 400 South Washington, DC 20004

Phone: 202-442-3000 Facsimile: 202-442-3199

Attachment: Proof of Service Under 37 CFR § 1.248

## PROOF OF SERVICE UNDER 37 CFR § 1.248

I hereby certify that a true copy of the foregoing APPLICANTS RESPONSE TO PETITIONERS' WITHDRAWAL FROM PUBLIC USE PROCEEDING AND REQUEST FOR RETURN OF ALL OF PETITIONERS' FILED PAPERS was served by facsimile and by U.S. First Class Mail this 18<sup>th</sup> day of August, 2003, on counsel for the Petitioner indicated below:

Jack S. Barufka Benjamin L. Kiersz Pillsbury Winthrop LLP 1600 Tysons Boulevard McLean, VA 22102 Tel: 703-905-2000

Fax: 703-905-2500

Attorney for Applicant

OFFICIAL

FAX RECEIVED

AUG 19 2003

TC 1700